

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 387 028

HE 028 609

AUTHOR Barnhart, Brian T.; Bechhofer, Shoshanah
 TITLE New Faculty Departure at Five Institutions.
 SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED),
 Washington, DC.
 PUB DATE Apr 95
 NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
 American Educational Research Association (San
 Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
 PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
 Research/Technical (143)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Case Studies; College
 Environment; *College Faculty; Comparative Analysis;
 Ethnic Discrimination; Faculty College Relationship;
 *Faculty Mobility; Faculty Publishing; Faculty
 Workload; Higher Education; Publish or Perish Issue;
 Research; Sex Discrimination; *Teacher Attitudes;
 Teacher Persistence; Teacher Responsibility
 IDENTIFIERS Faculty Attitudes; Faculty Research

ABSTRACT

This study of factors leading to early departure from institutions of higher education used case studies of five newly hired faculty members who left their institutions with five matched (for cohort, institution, and department) newly hired peers who remained. Survey data were gathered from newly hired faculty at five institutions during the 1991 and 1992 academic years. A sub-sample of this group who left their hiring institutions (Leavers) was identified in the spring of 1994 and interviewed over the telephone as were the "peer matches." "Peer matches," faculty in the same cohort, institution, and department as Leavers, were interviewed by telephone in the fall/winter of the 1994-95 academic year. Comparison of the pairs of leavers and matches found: (1) leavers believed more strongly that research success was more rewarded by their institutions than teaching success; (2) leavers perceived their institution's expectations for time spent on teaching to be lower than other respondents while spending less time teaching than their peer matches; (3) leavers gave less credence to feedback received from colleagues and chairs on both teaching and research; (4) leavers rated the fair treatment of female and minority faculty at their institutions lower than other respondents; (5) 40 percent of leavers reported some form of discrimination at their hiring institution; and (6) leavers reported having more control over their professional lives after leaving their hiring institution. (Contains 15 references.) (JB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

New Faculty Departure at Five Institutions

Brian T. Barnhart
and
Shoshanah Bechhofer

Northwestern University
and
National Center on Postsecondary
Teaching, Learning, and Assessment

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Brian Barnhart

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

April, 1995

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it
 Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy

HTC 2/27/95
Presentation at the 1995 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. Chart essay format suggested by Haensly, Lupkowski, and McNamara (1987).

The New Faculty Project is supported by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the United States Department of Education through the National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. NCTLA, an effort of a consortium of universities, is located at Pennsylvania State University. The New Faculty Project, based at Northwestern University, is under the direction of Robert J. Menges, Professor of Education and Social Policy. The opinions herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of OERI, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

This study explores factors leading to faculty departure from institutions of higher education. It includes case studies of five newly hired faculty members who have left their hiring institutions matched with five of their newly hired peers who have remained in the same department at the same hiring institution.

Early Indicators of Departure

Statistically significant differences on survey responses provided within the first six months of employment are presented as potential early indicators of variables which may impact a faculty member's decision to leave his/her hiring institution within the first three years of employment.

Retrospective Comments by Faculty

Interviews of matched pairs of Leavers and non-Leavers are presented to illustrate personal accounts of the attitudes, perceptions, and experiences which shape the decision to leave or stay at one's hiring institution. These accounts are contextualized by survey responses gathered at the start of their faculty position.

Contribution of This Study

Through the combination of survey and interview data collected over time, this study draws attention to the highly complex, personal, and contextualized nature of the decision to leave a position in an institution of higher education

RELATED RESEARCH

This study draws from both the theoretically diverse literature on employee turnover and the emerging occupation-specific literature on college faculty. Both sources aid our understanding of what motivates the decision to leave a position in higher education.

Employer Turnover Research

Identifying Salient Predictors

- Individual factors that are related to turnover include age, family obligations, spousal transfer, values, and expectations (Porter and Steers, 1973).
- Leavers are often characterized by high achievement orientation, aggression, independence, sociability, and self confidence (Porter and Steers, 1973).
- Those who stay in a position are often characterized by maturity, sincerity, and identification (Porter and Steers, 1973).
- Work-related factors which have been identified as impacting turnover include supervisory conduct, feedback, recognition, pay and benefits, social integration, autonomy, security, and interest (Porter and Steers, 1973; Price, 1977).

Processes Affecting Job Satisfaction

- Job satisfaction is defined as an emotional response to work factors shaped by individual factors (Loscocco and Rochelle, 1991).
- Job satisfaction may be affected by the following variables:
 - Need deficiencies (Maslow, 1954)
 - Competent self-identity (White, 1959)
 - Perceived inequity (Adams, 1965)

- Unmet expectations (Porter and Steers, 1973)
- Early career factors (Hall, 1976)
- Misfit between idiographic needs and nomothetic expectations (Mortimer, 1979)
- External locus of control (Weiner, 1980)

College Teaching Research

Identifying Salient Predictors

- Individual factors related to turnover among college teachers include stress, job-related esteem and feelings of accomplishment (Olsen, 1993).
- Work factors related to turnover among college teachers include the following variables (Olsen, 1993; Youn and Zelterman, 1988)
 - University structure and reward system
 - Salary
 - Participation in decision-making
 - Collegiality, support, and congeniality of colleagues
 - Feedback
 - Opportunity to use skills and abilities
 - Rapport with department leadership
 - Research opportunities
 - Reputation of department, campus, and associates
 - Type of institution

Processes Affecting Job Satisfaction

- Research has identified numerous findings about processes affecting job satisfaction (Bowen and Schuster, 1989; Olsen, 1993; Boice, 1992).
 - Intrinsic rewards are important for job satisfaction, while extrinsic rewards are related to job dissatisfaction.
 - High self-expectations among new college faculty make them vulnerable to disappointment and frustration.
 - High levels of stress characterize the first few years of college teaching due to excessive demands, time pressures, and balance issues.
 - Learning to manage time and effort is an important factor for new faculty success.
 - New faculty often have difficulty deciphering institutional expectations.
 - Organizational commitment is derived from clear equity criteria for rewards, and from friendly and supportive colleagues.
 - Involvement is crucial for a good start for new faculty.

RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Survey data were gathered from newly hired faculty at five institutions during the 1991 and 1992 academic years.

A subsample of this group who left their hiring institution ("Leavers") was identified in the spring of 1994 and interviewed over the telephone.

"Peer matches," faculty in the same cohort, institution, and department as Leavers, were interviewed by telephone in the fall/winter of the 1994-1995 academic year.

Five pairs of Leavers and peer matches are portrayed more extensively in brief case studies.

The data for this report comes from the New Faculty Project, a study of the National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. Surveys were returned by 259 newly hired tenure-track faculty from five institutions: a Rural Liberal Arts-I College, an Urban Liberal Arts-I College, a Community College District, a Comprehensive-I University, and a Research-I University (Carnegie Council, 1987).

Respondents completed a 16-page survey during the fall of the 1991 and 1992 academic years. Sixteen of the twenty-three faculty who left their hiring institution were interviewed by telephone through the fall of the 1994-1995 academic year using a modified version of a protocol designed at Pennsylvania State University. Six of twenty peer matches were interviewed by telephone through the winter of the 1994-1995 academic year using an interview protocol similar to that used with Leavers. (It should be noted that no peer who met the criteria set forth for peer matches could be identified for three Leavers.)

Survey questions related to several areas of respondents' academic positions including job satisfaction, perceived control, work environment, productivity, and stress. Interviews dealt with experiences while at the initial institution, experiences since leaving the institution, and factors impacting the decision to leave.

Table 1
Participants By Demographic Category

	Respondents (N=259)	Leavers (N=23)	Peer Matches (N=20)	Case Studies (N=10)
Gender				
Female	137 (53)	13 (57)	10 (50)	4 (40)
Race				
Minority	56 (22)	7 (30)	4 (20)	2 (20)
Field				
Humanities	55 (21)	4 (17)	3 (15)	2 (20)
Natural Sciences	50 (19)	4 (17)	4 (20)	2 (20)
Prof./Applied	106 (41)	14 (61)	12 (60)	4 (40)
Social Sciences	48 (19)	1 (5)	1 (5)	2 (20)
Institution				
Rural Liberal Arts	11 (4)	1 (4)	1 (5)	0 (0)
Urban Liberal Arts	15 (6)	2 (9)	2 (10)	0 (0)
Community College	83 (32)	2 (9)	1 (5)	0 (0)
Comp. Univ.	67 (26)	6 (26)	6 (30)	2 (20)
Research Univ.	83 (32)	12 (52)	10 (50)	8 (80)

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Analysis

Leavers were compared with (a) all other respondents to the first year survey and (b) peer matches. Also, content analysis was applied to interviews conducted with Leavers and peer matches.

Frequencies and t-tests were run for the analyzed variables.

Significant differences are reported at $p \leq .05$ unless otherwise noted.

Data Set

New Faculty Project Year 1 Survey for faculty hired in 1991 and 1992, funded by the U.S. Department of Education, through the National Center for Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment.

Respondents

259 newly hired faculty at five institutions. Response rate for the year one survey was 74.4 percent. Respondents are categorized into three subgroups. They are:

Leavers (N=23):

New faculty hired in 1991 or 1992 who were identified in 1994 as having left their initial hiring institution.

Peer Matches (N=20):

New faculty hired in 1991 or 1992 who were paired with identified Leavers based on same institution and department as individual Leavers. Three Leavers did not have a peer in this study who met these criteria.

All Other Respondents (N=236):

Respondents to the year 1 survey excluding identified Leavers.

Survey Instrument

The 16-page survey was completed in fall 1991 and fall 1992. It contained questions about job satisfaction, perceived control, work environment, productivity, stress, teaching beliefs, collegiality, mentoring, and workload. Some participants also completed second-year and third-year surveys. These data were used in constructing the case studies but are not included in the statistical analyses presented.

Interview Instruments

The 13-page interview for Leavers and the 12-page interview for peer matches were conducted by telephone throughout the fall and winter of the 1994-1995 academic year. They contained questions which paralleled the survey as well as questions about experiences at the hiring institution, experiences of Leavers since leaving the institution, and factors attributed to leaving the hiring institution. Interviews ranged from twenty-three to fifty-eight minutes in length.

RESULTS I

Leavers Compared With All Other Respondents (Survey)

Leavers rated some survey items differently than All Other Respondents. The four categories of variables are:

1. Teaching versus Research
2. Credence to Feedback
3. Equity
4. Miscellaneous

Teaching versus Research

Compared with All Other Respondents:

- Leavers gave lower ratings to their institution's support services for teaching.
- Leavers gave lower ratings to their institution's faculty commitment to teaching over research.
- Leavers gave higher ratings to research being rewarded more than teaching.
- Leavers gave higher ratings to "publishes" as a characteristic of valued faculty at their institution.
- Leavers reported that they perceive their institution expects less time be spent on teaching

Credence Given to Feedback

Compared with All Other Respondents:

- Leavers gave less credence to feedback from their chair about teaching.
- Leavers gave less credence to feedback from their colleagues about teaching.
- Leavers gave less credence to feedback from their chair about research. (p≤.08)

- Leavers gave less credence to feedback from their colleagues about research. (p≤.1)
- No difference was found between Leavers and All Other Respondents on the credence given to feedback from students about teaching.

Equity

Compared with All Other Respondents:

- Leavers gave lower ratings to the fair treatment of female faculty at their institution.
- Leavers gave lower ratings to the fair treatment of minority faculty at their institution.

Miscellaneous

Compared with All Other Respondents:

- Leavers were more likely to say that they would leave their hiring institution within three years of employment
- Leavers reported less overall job satisfaction within the first six months of employment.
- Leavers gave lower less satisfaction with benefits within the first six months of employment.

RESULTS II

Leavers Compared With Peer Matches (Survey)

Leavers rated some survey items differently than their Peer Matches. The three categories of variables are:

1. Credence to Feedback
2. Equity
3. Miscellaneous

Credence Given to Feedback

Compared with Peer Matches:

- Leavers gave less credence to feedback from their chair about teaching.
- Leavers gave less credence to feedback from their colleagues about teaching.
- Leavers gave less credence to feedback from their chair about research.
- Leavers gave less credence to feedback from their colleagues about research.
- No difference was found between Leavers and Peer Matches on the credence given to feedback from students about teaching.

Equity

Compared with Peer Matches:

- Leavers gave lower ratings to the fair treatment of female faculty at their institution.

Miscellaneous

Compared with Peer Matches:

- Leavers reported less overall job satisfaction within the first six months of employment. ($p \leq .1$)
- Leavers reported less satisfaction with benefits within the first six months of employment. ($p \leq .06$)
- Leavers spent more time on service activities.
- Leavers spent less time on teaching. ($p \leq .08$)

RESULTS III

Leavers Compared With Peer Matches (Interviews)

Compared With Peer Matches:

- Leavers were less satisfied with the work environment in their respective unit.
- Leavers received less feedback from chair on teaching and research, and were less satisfied with this feedback.
- Leavers received less feedback from colleagues on teaching and research, and were less satisfied with this feedback.
- Leavers had a lower sense of personal control in their research and career development.

Leavers and Matches Both:

- Found great satisfaction in courses they helped establish and/or develop.

RESULTS IV

Case Studies

Case Study 1: James and Henry Success vs. Satisfaction

- James appears to value "professional success" and was motivated to leave his hiring institution in order to pursue it. Henry was less concerned with "professional success."
- James is characterized by high achievement orientation and self confidence. Henry is characterized by sincerity and idealism.
- There appears to exist a lack of fit between James' research interests and those of his departmental colleagues.
- Henry stayed in his position despite low job satisfaction.
- Leadership exhibited by new faculty members may be a negative for the new hire rather than a positive.

Case Study 2: Stan and Charles Success Without Appreciation

- Charles was self-confident, sociable, and independent.
- Charles' early perceptions of collegiality in his department were clouded by "wishful thinking."
- Important factors in Charles' leaving his hiring institution include: unmet expectations of collegiality, and unfulfilled social needs.
- This case demonstrates the importance of "fit" in terms of research agenda and the negative effect of feelings of isolation.
- Stan acclimated slowly and successfully, while Charles entered his position enthusiastically and, ultimately, was disappointed.
- Collegiality, in this case study, was very important for Charles, who sought it out.

Case Study 3: Linda and Margaret Personal/Professional

- While both Linda and Margaret experienced personal issues that impacted upon their careers, it is important to note that Linda's personal situation, unlike Margaret's, was aggravated by professional dissatisfaction.
- Linda viewed Adams University as insensitive to her partner's employment situation.
- Lack of feedback was an important source of dissatisfaction for both Linda and Margaret.
- Linda's sense of isolation in her department seems to have played an important role in her job dissatisfaction.

Case Study 4: Greg and Sue Teaching vs. Research

- Greg and Sue initially came into the department with very different orientations, which shaped their responses to their experiences.
- Greg was not dependent on feedback from colleagues or chair to feel a sense of success since his primary measure of success was related to his teaching and student relations.
- Sue, whose chief interest is research, was very dependent on departmental colleagues for success, based on assignment of responsibilities and collegial atmosphere. She appears to be an example of a faculty member who is misfit due to the discrepancy between her personal needs and departmental expectations.

Case Study 5: Katy and Jim The Dual Career Bind

- It is very likely that, given the chance, Katy would have made a good adjustment to her position as did Jim.
- Economic downturns in specific geographic locations can make it difficult for both spouses to find desirable career positions.
- Universities must consider both the positives and negatives involved with getting involved with the job placement of new faculty spouses

CASE STUDIES

Case 1: James and Henry: Success vs. Satisfaction

Not always is the decision to leave a position in academia neatly tied to job satisfaction, or any other variable. In the following case, we present a leaver and a faculty member who stayed who do not fit any particular theory.

Both James and Henry worked in the same department of Research University. One left after one year; the other still remains after three years. If you were a university administrator, would you have been able to predict which one you were in danger of losing?

Early Indications:

On his first year survey, James indicated that he was very satisfied with his work load, very satisfied with his opportunity to advance, and somewhat dissatisfied with his salary and benefits. Henry, on the other hand, was somewhat dissatisfied with his work load, very dissatisfied with his opportunity to advance, and very dissatisfied with his salary and benefits. James had no stress resulting from his teaching load (he was teaching 13 graduate students at the time), while Henry had extensive stress resulting from his teaching load of 110 undergraduate students, as well as much more overall stress. Compared with Henry, James rated himself as having more influence over student learning, salary increases, pursuing his personal interests, and maintaining programs. Both answered that it was "somewhat likely" that they would leave their positions at Research University; Henry said if he were to leave he would want less teaching, service, and administration, and more research, advising students, and service to the community. James would want the same amount of everything. Research University was Henry's first choice for a position, while it was not James'. James saw the faculty in his department as more committed to teaching than to research, while Henry did not perceive the faculty in this way.

Henry wrote somewhat disparagingly of the "profession of professor." It "is not inherently more valuable than janitor - it is falsely elevated." He would rather have had "much more free time and a much smaller salary," and commented wistfully, "Unfortunately, the most desirable job I know of is that of 'graduate student,' which combines low responsibility, low salary, and great lifestyle."

Three Years Later:

When interviewed after taking their positions, both James and Henry felt encouraged by their colleagues to pursue their research agendas, and felt that they were treated equitably within the department.

James did not feel that the department had an environment conducive to his professional development, although he felt more strongly than Henry that his colleagues respected his research. When asked about perceptions of his own success at Research University, James consistently rated himself slightly higher than did Henry. James felt he had more and better quality feedback regarding his teaching from his department chair and colleagues, whereas Henry was slightly more satisfied with the feedback he had received from his students. James was somewhat dissatisfied with his salary, the working relationships in his department, and his job overall.

Henry did not feel he had had adequate information about the promotion and tenure process when he started his position, nor was he satisfied with the opportunities to discuss his progress with the department chair. The previous year Henry had asserted, "I have no stress about promotion and tenure, since I really don't give a damn...It's not like I need the money or care about the prestige. These people's values are all screwed up." Henry also thought that the expectations in the department regarding research were constraining and encouraged "standard research" rather than tolerating differences in approach. He was frustrated by the expectations for greater quantity, but not greater quality, of research, as well as by "the professionalization of the academy." He expressed satisfaction with the fact that he did not receive any feedback regarding his research from his colleagues.

While James was satisfied with his workload, Henry, who was recently married, was very dissatisfied, indicating that he had "no free time at all" and that, while he loved his work, he was not happy with his ability to balance work and home responsibilities. Henry felt that on the whole, while faculty got along well with each other personally, there was not much professional collegiality, and he was "very annoyed with a department that claims to develop its faculty but spends so little time doing it." He had observed both sexual and racial discrimination in the department, and felt that his own research interests, being different from those of his colleagues, were an obstacle for him. In terms of his overall job satisfaction, Henry responded that he is sure he will be very satisfied with this experience when he looks back on it in thirty years.

Henry was most satisfied with his instruction and his personal contact with students. A major source of dissatisfaction for him was the lack of "large blocks of time for research." James was most satisfied with the opportunities for doing things with his family in the region in which Research University is located. He was dissatisfied with departmental resources in terms of the development of the graduate program and the number of graduate students available for him to work with.

Henry's major contribution to Research University, in his estimation, was in bringing good publicity to the institution. He had appeared on local TV, edited a well-known newsletter, been interviewed by major publications, and received a

prestigious award. James' major contributions were in developing several new courses and in strengthening the perception of his particular domain within the department.

So, who left? Was it James, who felt that he commanded the respect of his colleagues, played a leadership role within his department, enjoyed living in the region, was satisfied with his workload while being dissatisfied with his salary and departmental resources for professional growth? Or was it Henry, who felt more successful in his teaching than in his research, who brought positive publicity to the institution but was relatively unappreciated by his colleagues because of his unique research agenda, and who refused to be taken in by the skewed value system he perceived as rampant among the professorate?

Unbeknownst to Research University, James knew when he began to work at Research that he was a potential job candidate at a nationally ranked department at a prominent research university, and was waiting for them to make a decision. "There was nothing they [Research] could have done [to get me to stay]. I left without animosity." Being respected and playing a leadership role at Research was not enough. "I was glad to have the opportunity to be there, but glad to leave, professionally."

As for Henry, he has seriously considered leaving, and will if he doesn't receive tenure. But his long-term career aspiration is "to be happy and useful," and his sense of self-worth does not seem to derive from the particular institution in which he finds himself. One suspects that if he does pull his research together and is awarded tenure, he will stay at Research - the job is convenient to his wife's medical practice - and continue to seek satisfaction in his teaching and in the reception his research receives outside the university.

Case 2: Stan and Charles: Success Without Appreciation

Stan and Charles began teaching in the same department of Comprehensive University in their mid-forties. Stan, who is Latino, had previously taught for four years in a different university, while Charles, an African-American, had taught high school for 16 1/2 years. Comprehensive University was the first choice for both Stan and Charles, and each indicated in his earliest survey that it was "not at all likely" that he would leave his position. Three years later, Stan remains and is satisfied with his job, while Charles has left for a "better opportunity."

Early Indications:

The first year surveys already showed a number of substantial differences between Stan's and Charles' experiences in the department, as well as their needs and expectations. Stan was already experiencing stress due to time pressures; Charles wasn't experiencing much stress at all (3 on a scale of 1 to 10). On a self-report measure of job-related skills and abilities, Charles was highly self-confident, rating himself at the top of the scale in every aspect of his abilities. Stan rated himself more modestly. Charles also rated himself as having "substantial influence" over most aspects of his career, with Stan less sure of his influence. Stan rated himself "fairly successful" in his career; Charles rated himself as "very successful."

In terms of their initial expectations, Stan attached importance to the quality of students he would teach, and was disappointed in that regard, a disappointment that would grow over the next three years. He was also dissatisfied with his work load.

Charles, on the other hand, was to be strongly disappointed in the collegiality of the department, to which he attached much importance and which he perceived very positively in this early survey. He rated colleagues/quality of department as "very important" to him. While Stan indicated that he had not yet received any feedback from anyone (the first survey was completed during fall of the first year on the job), Charles indicated he would give "a great deal of credence" to feedback from his chair, his colleagues, and his students regarding both his teaching and his scholarship. Beyond the high degree of importance Charles attached to the collegial relationships he anticipated forming, Charles perceived himself as already enjoying far more collegiality than did Stan. Charles indicated having weekly interaction with 13-18 colleagues - Stan, with two. Charles reported some collaboration in his teaching and his research - Stan did not. Stan considered himself to be "essentially working alone," while Charles indicated that he was "a member of a large group," that he and his colleagues both initiated collegial interactions, and rated the department collegiality as "very good." It is impossible to know, of course, to what extent these responses reflected Charles' general tendency to notice and accentuate the positive; but

we can certainly surmise that Charles had a strong desire for professional community.

Three Years Later:

Interviewed three years into the job, Stan agreed that the department had an environment conducive to his professional development, felt encouraged by his colleagues to pursue his research agenda, felt his colleagues respected his research and that he was treated equitably. Charles disagreed on all of the above. Stan considered departmental expectations regarding research, teaching, and service to be clear and appropriate for him, although he wished for less teaching responsibility. Charles, on the other hand, felt that the type and amount of research and teaching he was doing did not fit into the departmental culture. His colleagues "weren't into" the research he was doing; they "had tenure and weren't keeping up with research." He also reported meeting with resistance when trying to implement innovations in his teaching, "resistance because of ignorance." Charles felt that expectations regarding his professional growth were "fuzzy" - "I really had no clear path there." As an African-American, Charles did experience some discrimination. "It was there, but I don't think the people who did those things totally realized it." Stan had an informal mentor who was useful in his professional development. Charles was "too busy teaching and going to conferences to think about" a mentor, although upon reflection, he said that a mentor could have helped him to "know what to do" when he met with resistance. He felt that his idiosyncratic research interests may have been an obstacle to his success at the departmental level, although the central administration did encourage his research.

Stan experienced considerable stress in his job due to a lack of time and budget uncertainties in his department, whereas Charles reported little stress despite the resistance he encountered. Unlike Stan, Charles felt all along that his research and teaching performance were completely under his control, although he was not as sure about his control over his career development.

Stan was particularly dissatisfied with the "extreme cultural diversity of the student population" and particularly satisfied with the freedom he had to do the research he wanted to do. Charles' dissatisfaction stemmed from his departmental colleagues' reactions to him, "obstacles that shouldn't have been there," including resistance to his classroom innovations and lack of appreciation. He did take partial blame for that. "I think it was a mistake [to implement those innovations]; I should have waited. In graduate school you're doing these cutting edge things - I don't think I was appreciated [for doing them on the job]." Looking back on the experience, he reflected, "Being a rookie, I thought it [resistance] was from everywhere. But it probably wasn't."

On the positive side, Charles was very satisfied with his research opportunities, several of his colleagues who "were consistently there and encouraged me," the university as a whole, and the support for his research and conference attendance. "It's an excellent university overall. I got along with my deans and people in other departments. The students were ok." He felt that he had made some major contributions to the university while he was there. "After the first year, people started doing a lot of the things [i.e. innovations] I suggested. Now a lot of those things are in place." He also felt that he had represented the university well nationally and internationally. "Every time I gave a conference I carried the [university] banner."

Despite the disappointments, Charles continued to perceive himself as highly successful, feeling "good and confident" about his overall career. He left Comprehensive University to join a department in a research university that appreciated his research. He would have stayed at his first position, he asserted, if he had had "encouragement" and "more appreciation of the kind of work" he was doing.

Stan approached his new position with modest expectations of himself and of his new environment. He was not particularly interested in collegiality and was less demanding in that regard. While he resented the perpetual time crunch, he seems to have blended into the department fairly unobtrusively, if unspectacularly. Charles came into the position with high expectations of himself and of his colleagues. He was not looking to be unobtrusive, he was looking for professional community, and with his "cutting edge" approach in research and teaching, he fully expected to be appreciated and accepted. He never did find his place in the department, however. Whether this was due to race, research agenda, or innovative teaching practices he could not be sure. Given his strong internal locus of control, self confidence, and positive outlook, Charles' decision to leave Comprehensive University, apparently made without rancor, appears to have been healthy and adaptive for him. It most probably represents a loss to the university, and a restoring of equilibrium to the department in which he was a member.

Case 3: Linda and Margaret: Personal /Professional

For Linda, the most important factor in choosing a position was the opportunity for scholarship. Institutional support of teaching, quality of students, and salary were unimportant considerations. Adams University, a research university, was her first choice, but she indicated on her early survey that it was "somewhat likely" she would leave during the next three years. Her interests lay in both teaching and research, leaning toward research. Given her bent toward research, it is particularly significant that in her earliest survey, Linda was "very dissatisfied" with the quality of her research facilities and the mix of teaching, research, and service required of her. Although she considered herself "very successful" in her career at that point, major sources of stress for her were fundraising expectations and her teaching load.

She was doing slightly more teaching and less research than her personal preference. By the second year, Linda was doing vastly more teaching and less research than her personal preference. She was finding it very difficult to teach effectively, to obtain grants, publish, and work the system. Her overall stress level was very high, with teaching causing her the most stress.

She was very frustrated and worried about her teaching and research activities, and this seems to have led to a general dissatisfaction with her job. Her satisfaction with various job facets was quite low, with nothing rated above "somewhat satisfied." She indicated that it was "very likely" that she would leave the institution during the next three years. Linda's third year survey finds her feeling more positive about her teaching, but not about her research. Most of her stress came from research and publishing demands. The amount of time devoted to teaching and research was still off from her personal preference, but not as much as the previous year. She remained "very dissatisfied" with the support for research and quality of research facilities available to her. Linda came to Adams to fill a position vacated by a man who had sexually harassed women for years, and she found the morale in the department very low. She was very dissatisfied with the working relationships in her unit; many of her colleagues had "funky personalities" and were "socially inept." In particular, her chair, had, in her opinion, discriminated against her because of her gender.

As the only trained sub-specialist in the department, she found herself isolated as her colleagues were largely ignorant about her scholarly activities and made no attempts to find out about her field. From the beginning, Linda was "essentially working alone." In her second year survey Linda indicated that none of her colleagues could have taught her courses if she was unavailable, and only two could comment on her scholarly work. She initiated most interactions with colleagues, and she rated department collegiality poor to very poor. She was doing no collaborating during this second year on research. Her dissatisfaction with the "spirit of cooperation among the faculty" deepened with her department chair. Expectations for research, scholarship, professional

growth, and teaching were very unclear to her. She received very little feedback about her research and teaching, and was particularly unhappy with the lack of feedback from her chair. She began to solicit evaluation of her teaching from her colleagues, and this feedback improved in quality over the years. On her scholarly work she received comments from only one colleague. She was very dissatisfied with what she perceived as an excessive workload. "Eighty hours per week is too much," she commented, adding that being tenure-oriented she could not let down on this hectic schedule. She did have a "very useful" mentor.

Linda was involved with a man from out of state who had spent a one-year sabbatical at Adams. In each of her yearly surveys, she indicated dissatisfaction with "employment opportunities for her spouse in the geographic area." She was very disappointed that no one had asked her if her partner was interested in moving to the area, and she felt that the situation would have been approached differently by her "bumbling idiot of a department chair" if she had been a male involved with a woman from out of state. By her third year survey, Linda had found a position in her partner's home state and was planning her transfer. In retrospect, Linda indicated that during her stay at Adams she had been most satisfied with her teaching and least satisfied with her research. She felt she had made some major contributions to Adams, bringing the people in the department back together socially after replacing her predecessor - she "broke the ice" for the department. She also had succeeded in significantly raising the number of Fullbright Scholars among the students by encouraging them to seek such possibilities. Linda left Adams University for both personal and professional reasons. She would have stayed if her partner had been living in the same city and if she had gotten lab facilities for her research. She is now at a university out of state, living with her partner, and feeling more controlled over her research performance and career development in her new, lab-equipped, position.

When Margaret chose to come to Adams University, it was her first choice. Very important factors in this choice were opportunities for scholarship, support for teaching, and colleagues/department quality. With interests leaning toward research, Margaret indicated it was "not at all likely" that she would leave this research university. Her first year survey found her generally quite satisfied. She gave moderate credence to any and all feedback, expressed confidence in her own teaching ability, and was very happy with the support for research available to her. She found faculty in the department generally committed to teaching, with two colleagues capable of teaching her courses for her and seven able to comment on her scholarship. Margaret rated the collegiality in her position as good, reported that both she and her colleagues initiated interactions, and was already working with one or two colleagues. Her personal preferences for time allocation aligned with those she perceived of the institution, but were far from the actual time she spent on research versus teaching.

Margaret experienced a very high stress level (10 out of 10), mostly coming from managing household responsibilities, finishing her dissertation, and time pressures. On Margaret's second year survey, she expressed slight dissatisfaction with the spirit of cooperation among faculty. She had never received any feedback from anyone on her teaching or research, excepting student evaluation forms. She was "worried" and "hopeful" about her research, "proud" "hopeful" and "confident" about her teaching. Her time allocation between teaching and research was coming closer to her personal preference, although her service responsibilities were now taking away her time for research. Her stress level remained very high, with stress coming from managing her household, child care, and research demands. Time pressures were the most stressful for her.

On the final survey, Margaret was "very dissatisfied" with the lack of feedback on her teaching from her chair and colleagues, and from her chair on her research. She considered herself as teaching effectively, communicating well, working skillfully with students, and an excellent lecturer. She was working with one or two colleagues on her research, and rated collegiality in her department good to very good. However, she was experiencing more stress at this point than previously, deriving from research demands and marital friction. Looking back during her fourth year interview, Margaret was generally satisfied in her position. She considered herself very successful in her teaching and had received "tons" of very positive feedback from her students, so the lack of feedback on her teaching from her chair "did not much matter" to her. She was satisfied with the comments she received on her scholarly work from her chair and colleagues.

She felt she was not doing enough research and was therefore somewhat dissatisfied with her progress toward tenure, but she attributed this at this point to the fact that as a now single mother with two children, time demands were very strong. She was not happy with her ability to balance work and home responsibilities, and rated her level of stress as 10. The personal source of this stress was undergoing a divorce, taking care of two children by herself, and selling the house - an "especially rough time." Margaret acknowledged the possibility that she may have to leave Adams in the event of a negative outcome in her "custody battle" with her ex-spouse. Margaret has found it stressful and difficult to "get grants funded, to get [her] research off the ground, and to put a collegial research team together." She would advise someone in her position to "learn quickly to be selfish with your time." She does feel she has been a good colleague, has filled a void in the department with her teaching, and is especially proud of an interesting research program she developed for students.

Case 4: Greg and Sue: Teaching vs. Research

This department at the University of Thomasville was not Greg's first choice, and he indicated early on that it was "somewhat likely" he would leave for another position during the next 3 years. His interests lay in both teaching and research, but leaning toward teaching; in choosing a position, the quality of students had been "very important" to him, with the opportunities for scholarship "not a factor." Although he preferred to work in a state college with equal emphasis on research and teaching, his second choice would have been a small college with primary emphasis on undergraduate teaching. If he were to leave Thomasville, he would seek an opportunity to do more student advising and community service than he anticipated doing at Thomasville.

In his early survey, Greg gave more credence to feedback about his research than to feedback about his teaching. He did not feel that the department had helpful support services for his research, and he also did not believe that the faculty in his department were particularly committed to teaching.

Communicating well and working skillfully with students were "not very difficult" for him, and he felt he had "substantial influence" over student learning. However, he saw himself spending 93% of his time on teaching and only 5% on research, whereas his personal preference would have been 40% on teaching and 35% on research. Although he was for the most part satisfied with his job at this early stage, Greg was somewhat dissatisfied with the time available for him to work with students as an advisor and mentor, and with the relationship between administration and faculty at Thomasville. Greg was "essentially working alone" on his research, but had considerable social interaction with his colleagues and felt there were ten of them who could give him constructive criticism of his scholarly work. He was not experiencing high levels of stress, but found the lack of personal time moderately stressful. Greg was still working on finishing his dissertation at this point, and considered himself "fairly successful" in his career.

Three years later, Greg was satisfied with his job. Although he had not had adequate information about the promotion and tenure process when he first began, he commented that "everyone is a little clueless at that time." He found the expectations regarding scholarship and teaching to be clear and appropriate for him, but felt the department gave "mixed messages" regarding expectations of service, asking him to serve on many committees while not rewarding service very highly. He rated himself highly successful in his teaching (9 of 10) and only moderately successful in his research (5 of 10). He was not satisfied with the very small amount of feedback he had been receiving on his scholarly work, the comments being "very general" and "not too helpful," and was somewhat dissatisfied with not having found a mentor. Greg considered himself a good researcher but "behind the game."

Greg's major source of stress three years into the job was his research agenda, and he felt he had been "let to sink or swim on [his] own" in this regard. He derived much satisfaction from teaching and from his interactions with his students, however, and felt his major contribution to the department lay in his teaching, committee work, and a new program he had founded. He had never seriously considered leaving his position at Thomasville, and would only leave in the unlikely event he did not gain tenure.

Sue came to the management department at Thomasville with a very different orientation than Greg. Institutional support of teaching and quality of students were very unimportant to her, with opportunity for scholarship and quality of department very important. Thomasville was not her first choice, although she indicated it was "not at all likely" that she would leave her position in the next three years. Her interests leaned toward research, and if she were to leave this position, she would seek the opportunity to do more research and less teaching, student advising, and service than she anticipated doing at Thomasville. She gave more credence to feedback from her colleagues than from her chair or students.

Early on, Sue was very dissatisfied with spousal employment opportunities in the geographic area, and somewhat dissatisfied with her authority to make decisions, time available to mentor students, the reputation of the institution, the quality of the research facilities, and her job overall. She did not believe that female and minority faculty were treated fairly at Thomasville. Sue indicated a significant number of colleagues with whom she interacted, and she had a mentor whom she had approached. She found managing household responsibilities and long-distance commuting extremely stressful, and being organized and knowing how to work the system the most difficult for her.

Sue was not teaching at all at the time of the initial survey, and she expected to publish three articles, two book chapters, and to make two conference presentations, plans which she rated "very realistic." She reported spending 60% of her time on research and indicated a personal preference for spending 90% of her time on research and 0% on teaching. As reported in an interview three years later, it had quickly become apparent to Sue that she was not going to be happy in her department at Thomasville. "The faculty were at war with each other." About half of them were "over age of 50 and no longer actively researching...just defending their turf." While her own research was respected by her colleagues, the tenured faculty "left everything to the junior faculty" and she did not feel she was treated equitably. "Elder faculty did nothing" in terms of teaching and service assignments. The department chair was a major hindrance to Sue. When asked about her satisfaction with opportunities to discuss her progress toward tenure with the chair, Sue laughed and said, "No such thing!" She talked about the "complete absence of leadership," the fact

that the chair fell asleep several times at meetings, and that he "did not know much about universities."

The second problem was a misfit between her passion for research and the department's expectations, which were "too lenient." She had been trained at a prestigious research university and she was "used to pressure [regarding] research," but she had come "to a place that did not care." In fact, she had to "invest in [her] own professional growth," pay for conferences "out of [her] own pocket," even buy her own textbooks. She wished there were "more research focus." Sue found herself successful in her teaching but very unsuccessful in her research. A week before her second quarter she had been asked to teach a core course which was not at all in her area of expertise. She received no feedback from her colleagues or her chair on her teaching or her research. The only feedback she did receive were "inappropriate sexual responses" from students on their evaluation forms.

Sue's spouse, also an academician, had been told there would be a position for him at Thomasville, but when the economy "turned sour" there was "absolutely no support to help him" and he was left unemployed. Sue's major source of stress while at Thomasville were the department conflict and her "dual-career situation." While she enjoyed her colleagues on a personal level and was satisfied with her salary and benefits, the department politics and lack of emphasis on research were decisive factors in her choice to leave. Sue is not in a tenure-track position at a research university, and feeling that her teaching and research performance are completely under her control.

Case 5: Katy and Jim: The Dual Career Bind

Katy and Jim both came to St. John University (fictional school name), a research university with a strong bent toward research. Institutional support of teaching was not a factor in either of their decisions. For Jim, who was single, this was a first choice and he considered it "not at all likely" that he would leave within three years. For Katy, however, St. John was not a first choice, geographic location had been the deciding factor in her choice to come, and she considered it "very likely" that she would leave.

Jim's early survey responses show him somewhat dissatisfied with interdepartmental cooperation, the spirit of cooperation among faculty, the quality of the graduate students, and teaching assistance - but very satisfied with his job overall. Katy was generally satisfied with all facets of the job, but very dissatisfied with opportunities for spousal employment in the geographic area of the university. Both were essentially working alone, neither had a mentor, and both experienced stress from time pressures. Jim also experienced stress due to his teaching load (he reported spending 80% of his time on teaching), while Katy experienced stress about her spouse's job prospects.

At this point their stories diverge. While Jim remained at St. John, Katy decided at the end of the year to leave. Jim went through the familiar experiences: dissatisfaction with lack of feedback, frustration about his research, stress due to research and publishing demands, feelings of isolation. After three years, however, he had positive feelings about working in his department. He felt expectations were clear and appropriate, was satisfied with his progress on his research, and was close to publishing a book. His advice to someone considering a position like his would be, "Take it, it's a good university and very supportive."

Katy, on the other hand, moved to an institution in the same city as her husband. She was dissatisfied with a lot about that institution: the work load, the spirit of cooperation among faculty, the quality of the research facilities, the teaching and the research assistance. She experienced poor collegiality in terms of research collaboration, and was spending far more time teaching, to her chagrin, than she had been at St. John University. Her stress level was about the same as it had been at St. John, and she actually considered herself less successful in her new career than she had been in her previous position.

In her interview, Katy recalled being satisfied with her working relationships at St. John and had found the expectations regarding teaching and research clear and appropriate for her. She had been satisfied with the feedback she had received, and felt the teaching assignments were more equitably assigned at

St. John than at any other institution with which she was familiar. She had been "very very satisfied" with her job overall.

However, there had been "no chance of employment" for her husband in academia in the area. She had experiences of stress due to personal difficulties related to her husband not finding a job, and due to difficulties with the administration at St. John over her leaving the institution after just one year.

Katy felt "quite sad, actually" about leaving St. John. She had been fond of her colleagues and students, a group she described as "a very mature and spirited group." She had contributed to her department by developing two new courses and by building ties with other units. She would be "very encouraging" to someone considering a job at St. John University. She still feels both partners in a marriage should search for a job that is right for their careers, and would "do it the same way again." Katy's experience at St. John is recalled as positive, if short.

KEY FINDINGS

Teaching versus Research

- Compared with All Other Respondents, Leavers in this study believe more strongly that research success is more rewarded by their institution than teaching success,
- Leavers perceive their institution's expectations for time spent on teaching to be lower than All Other Respondents, while spending less time teaching than Peer Matches.

Credence to Feedback

- Leavers give less credence to feedback received from colleagues and chair on both teaching and research, compared with All Other Respondents and Peer Matches..

Equity

- Leavers rate the fair treatment of female and minority faculty lower than All Other Respondents. They rate the fair treatment of female faculty lower than Peer Matches.
- 40% of Leavers reported some form of discrimination at their hiring institution

Early Indicators of Departure

Within the first six months of employment, Leavers:

- Say they are more likely than All Other Respondents to leave the hiring institution within three years.
- Report less overall job satisfaction than All Other Respondents and Peer Matches

Control

Leavers report having more control over their professional lives after leaving their hiring institution:

- 60% report more control in their research activities
- 80% report more control in their career development
- 70% report more control over things in general
- 50% report more control over their teaching

Leavers' Destinations Following Departure

- 30% of Leavers left academia
- 100% of Leavers have remained in the job taken immediately after leaving the hiring institution

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

Several directions for future research suggest themselves from our study:

- The relationship between initial orientation to research or teaching and the subsequent job satisfaction needs to be explored in greater depth.
- The findings indicating lower credence given to feedback among Leavers raise an interesting question. Are individuals who are less receptive to feedback more likely to leave, or are Leavers' chairs and colleagues less capable of providing high-quality feedback?
- The perception of teaching as a domain under a faculty member's control, as opposed to research, needs to be explored to disentangle the variables: teaching/research orientation, and sense of control.
- New faculty feelings of isolation versus integration into his/her department should be explored in greater depth.

Implications for administrators in higher education, including department chairs include:

- When considering the appointment of new faculty, the fit between a candidate's teaching/research orientation and that of the department/institution should be a prime consideration.
- The expectations for balance between research and teaching needs to be communicated more clearly to new faculty.
- Collegiality can be an important determinant of job satisfaction for those new faculty who seek it.
- Periodic assessment of new faculty's desire for feedback could help chairs identify those who may need more assistance in either teaching or research.
- Department chairs and administrators need to be cognizant of early indicators of new faculty isolation or misfit which may precede long-term job dissatisfaction.
- The importance of new faculty's spousal employment should not be minimized.

REFERENCES

Adams, J.S. (1965). Injustice in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances In Experimental Social Psychology. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Boice, R. (1992). The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bowen, H., and Schuster, J. (1986). American professors: A national resource imperiled. New York, NY: Oxford Press.

Carnegie Council (1987). A classification of institutions of higher education. Chronicle of Higher Education, 33, 22 - 30.

Haensly, P.A., Lupkowski, A.E., & McNamara, J.F. (1987). The chart-essay: A strategy for communicating research findings to policy makers and practitioners. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9, 63-75.

Hall, D. (1976). Careers in organizations. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.

Lawler, Edward. (1973). Motivation in work organizations. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Loscocco, K.A., and Rochelle, A.R. (1991). Influences on the quality of work and non-work life: Two decades in review. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39, 182-225.

Maslow, A. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York, NY: Harper.

Mortimer, J.T. (1979). Changing attitudes toward work: Highlights of the literature. Scarsdale, NY: America Institute.

Olsen, D. (1993). Work satisfaction and stress in the first and third year of academic appointment. Journal of Higher Education, 64, 4, 453-71.

Porter, L.W., and Steers, R.M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. Psychological Bulletin, 80, 2, 151-76.

Price, J.L. (1977). The study of turnover. Ames, IA: State University Press.

Weiner, B. (1980). The role of affect in rational (attributional) approaches to human motivation. Educational Researcher, 7-8: 4-11.

Youn, T., and Zelterman, D. (1988). Institutional career mobility in academia. In D. Breneman and T. Youn (eds.), Academic Labor Markets and Careers. Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.